

Application No. 09/821,442
Amendment dated March 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2005

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-3, 8, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication No. US-2002/0057351 A1 to Suzuki et al. (“Suzuki et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,975 B1 to Suzuki (“Suzuki ‘975”).

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication No. US-2001/0001563 A1 to Tomaszewski (“Tomaszewski”) in view of International Publication No. WO 99/40723 to Clemens (“Clemens”) in view of Suzuki et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,122 B1 to Anderson et al. (“Anderson et al.”).

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Suzuki ‘975, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,492 B1 to Nakamura (“Nakamura”).

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 4, and 8 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter of the invention. Claims 3, 7, and 11 are amended to be consistent with amended claims 1 and 8. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The rejection of claims 1-3, 8, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Suzuki ‘975, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to clarify that the re-configurable circuit is configured to provide different logic circuits to provide the camera with different functions in response to a user operation to switch an operating mode of the camera. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "... a controller for reading the first program from the memory and re-configuring the re-configurable circuit based on the first program so as to configure a first logic circuit when the first mode is selected by the mode selector and for reading the second program from the memory and re-configuring the re-configurable circuit based on the second program so as to configure a second logic circuit which is different than the first logic circuit when the second mode is selected by the mode selector."

The Examiner states that Suzuki (US 20020057351) discloses that CPU 34 may be implemented as ... a PLD, PLA, FPGA, or PAL. However, Suzuki merely discloses that multiple types of circuits may be employed as the element referred to as CPU 34, so far as it executes the single flow chart shown in the drawings. Suzuki does not disclose that the PLD, etc. is reconfigured to provide different logic circuits so as to selectively provide a camera with a plurality of functions according to a camera operation selected by the user. Indeed, Suzuki provides no suggestion or teaching with respect to employing a re-configurable circuit in this manner. It is further submitted that Suzuki (USP 6,380,975) also fails to provide any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion with respect to employing a re-configurable circuit in this manner. Therefore, the combination of Suzuki et al and Suzuki '975 is distinguished by claim 1 and 8, as well as by claims 2-3 and 11 which depend therefrom.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-3, 8, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Suzuki '975, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Tomaszewski in view of Clemens in view of Suzuki et al, and further in view of Anderson et al., is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite “a controller for reading the first program from the memory and re-configuring the re-configurable circuit based on the first program so as to configure a first logic circuit when the kind of the data communication standard of the equipment connected to the communication portion is judged as the first data communication standard by the detector and for reading the second program from the memory and re-configuring the re-configurable circuit based on the second program so as to configure a second logic circuit when the kind of the data communication standard of the equipment is judged as the second data communication standard.” That is, the re-configurable circuit is reconfigured to based on which data communication standard is being used. In contrast, the portion of Clemens (WO 99/40723) cited by the Examiner merely discloses that the device includes a host/PC communications interface 154 which is communicable with an external device using a computer peripheral equipments bus standard. Clemens discloses that the bus standard to be used can be, for example, the RS-232 serial interface, the Universal Serial bus (USB) standard, or the higher performance IEEE Standard 1394-1995 standard. However, Clemens does not disclose that the interface may communicate using multiple standards, or that communication may be conducted by changing the communications standard between a first data communication standard and the second data communication standard. Moreover, neither reference suggests judging which one of multiple communication standards should be selected. Accordingly, even if Suzuki et al is combined with Clemens, the combination does not provide that communication is conducted by changing between a first communication standard and a second communication standard using the common connection port.

Furthermore, neither Suzuki et al., nor Clemens suggests that a single re-configurable circuit configures the logic circuits which are different from each other to

Application No. 09/821,442
Amendment dated March 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2005

provide the plural functions which are different from each other. Indeed, Clemens does not have any concept of employing the re-configurable chip to this end.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomaszewski in view of Clemens in view of Suzuki et al, and further in view of Anderson et al., be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Suzuki '975, and further in view of Nakamura, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8, which distinguishes over Suzuki et al, and Suzuki '975 as provided hereinabove. It is respectfully submitted that Nakamura does not add any of the teachings missing from the combination of Suzuki et al, and Suzuki '975. For example, Nakamura does not teach a re-configurable circuit. Therefore, the combination of Suzuki et al., Suzuki '975, and Nakamura is distinguished by claims 9 and 10.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. in view of Suzuki '975, and further in view of Nakamura, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a

Application No. 09/821,442
Amendment dated March 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 9, 2005

fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. DeHaemer
Registration No. 39,164
Attorney for Applicant

MJD/lhb:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3335
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
March 9, 2006